

## REMARKS

Claims 51-62, and 71-74 are presently pending. Claims 1-50 and 63-70 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 51-62, and 71-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b), 112 as being anticipated by Akiyama and for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Additionally, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failure to disclose every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Examiner has asked “wherein is the limitation ‘while continuing storing said how many pixels in memory’ support in the specification?”. Assignee respectfully submits that the foregoing limitations is supported in the specification, at least on pages 61-63, Figures 15 and 16. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 51-62 and 71-74 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as well as the objection to the drawings.

Examiner has indicated that Akiyama teaches “blanking out how many pixels are indicated by the numerical value of the plurality of graphics data (command 84, e.g., if the horizontal scroll trigger was set to five. Five pixels is defined by the intersection of 5 rows and 5 columns, and commanding 82 to be deleted 5 pixels when 5 pixels removed out at the vertical edge of the screen, col. 6, lines 33-38), while continuing storing said how many pixels in memory (partition windows 76 and 77 are mapped into the exact same space in screen buffer 70, fig. 3, col. 4, lines 6-7)”.

Assignee respectfully submits that while col. 4, lines 6-7 recites, “For example, partition windows 76 and 77 are mapped into the exact same space in screen buffer 70”, it is noted that Akiyama also states “the partition windows associated with the partitions in the scroll group will all shift right in presentation space buffer 50 whenever the cursor is within give spaces of the right edge of a partition window.” Thus, Akiyama does not teach or fairly suggest “blanking out how many pixels are indicated by the numerical value of the plurality of graphics data, while continuing storing said how many pixels in memory”.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reason, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 51 and its dependent claims. Similarly, claims 55, 59 and 74 and their dependent claims should also be allowed.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims in the application are allowable, thereby placing the application in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 13-0017.

RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED

December 17, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mirut Dalal  
Attorney for Assignee  
Reg. No. 44,052

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison – Suite 3400  
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000  
FAX (312) 775-8100